Polar codes with a stepped boundary

Ilya Dumer

February 15, 2017

arXiv:1702.04886v1 [cs.IT] 16 Feb 2017

Abstract: We consider explicit polar constructions of block-length $n \to \infty$ for the two extreme cases of code rates $R \to 1$ and $R \to 0$. For code rates $R \to 1$, we design codes with complexity order of $n \log n$ in code construction, encoding, and decoding. These codes achieve the vanishing output bit error rates on the binary symmetric channels with any transition error probability $p \to 0$ and perform this task with a substantially smaller redundancy $(1-R)n$ than do other known high-rate codes, such as BCH codes or Reed-Muller (RM). We then extend our design to the low-rate codes that achieve the vanishing output error rates with the same complexity order of $n \log n$ and an asymptotically optimal code rate $R \to 0$ for the case of $p \to 1/2$.

Keywords: Polar codes; Reed-Muller codes; Boolean polynomials; successive cancellation decoding.

I. Introduction

Below we consider the Plotkin recursive construction $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v}$ that repeatedly combines shorter codes to construct and decode the longer ones. RM codes $\mathcal{R}(r,m)$ represent one Plotkin-type construction [1] of length $n = 2^m$ and dimension $k(r,m) = \sum_0^r \binom{m}{i}$ with parameters $0 \le r \le m$. Polar codes [3] introduce another recursive design. Both codes originate from the same full–space code $\mathcal{R}(m,m)$ and filter it in two different ways. Namely, a code $\mathcal{R}(r,m)$ maximizes the code rate among all codes that have the same distance 2^{m-r} and are generated by the m-variate Boolean monomials. Polar codes use a more intricate optimization. First, the successive-cancellation decoding (SCD) of [2]-[6] performs step-by-step retrieval of information bits of code $\mathcal{R}(m,m)$. Analysis of SCD [6] shows that it yields both high and low-fidelity information bits for RM codes. Therefore, removing low-fidelity bits (by setting them as zeros) gives the better-performing subcodes of RM codes. For relatively short lengths of 512 or less, this was done in [5], [6]. In particular, it turns out that these subcodes achieve a nearly optimal (ML) performance on these lengths if SCD is combined with list decoding. For long codes with $m \to \infty$, the major breakthrough achieved in [3] shows that the subcodes of $\mathcal{R}(m,m)$ that keep Rn most reliable bits are capacity achieving (CA) codes under SCD for any binary symmetric memoryless channel U and any code rate $R \in (0,1)$. These polar codes also achieve a polynomial complexity of construction. Namely, for a channel U with capacity C, polar codes of code rate $R > C - \epsilon$ have complexity [11] of order $\mathsf{poly}(a\epsilon^{-\mu})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, where $a = a(U)$ and μ are some constants.

I. Dumer is with the College of Engineering, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, USA; email: dumer@ee.ucr.edu

Below, we extend the above results for the special cases of $R \to 1$ and $R \to 0$. In both cases, we consider code families that achieve a vanishing output bit error rate on a binary symmetric channel BSC(p) with a transition error probability p and capacity $C = 1 - h(p)$, where $h(p)$ is a binary entropy. We say that a family of codes with $n \to \infty$ and $R \to 1$ is strongly optimal if the fraction $\rho = 1 - R$ of redundant (parity-check) bits has the smallest possible order

$$1 - R \sim h(p) = p \log_2 (e/p) + O(p^2)$$

A family of long codes is called weakly optimal if probability $p \to 0$ and redundancy ρ have a similar decline rate

$$\log_2(1-R) \sim \log_2 h(p) \sim \log_2 p \tag{1}$$

Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 1. *For any $p \to 0$, there exist weakly optimal codes of length $n \to \infty$ that have a relative redundancy*

$$\rho \le p \left(\log_2 1/p\right)^{\log_2 \log_2 1/p} \tag{2}$$

and achieve a vanishing error probability on a binary symmetric channel BSC(p). These codes can be constructed, encoded, and decoded with complexity of order $n \ln n$.

Similarly, long codes of rate $R \to 0$ are called strongly optimal if they achieve a vanishing output error rate on a BSC(p) with $p \to 1/2$ and have the maximum possible order of code rate $R \sim 1 - h(p) \sim (1-2p)^2/\ln 4$. We extend Theorem 1 and design strongly optimal codes of rate $R \to 0$ and complexity $n \ln n$.

For a wide range of error probabilities p, codes of Theorem 1 outperform known codes of code rate $R \to 1$. For example, long primitive BCH codes require redundancy $p \log_2 n$ to achieve a vanishing output error rate under the bounded-distance decoding on a BSC(p) if $p = o(\log_2 n)$ [1]. However, $R \to 0$ if $p \log_2 n \to \infty$. The recent breakthrough of [12] also shows that high-rate RM codes $\mathcal{R}(m-2r-1, m)$ can correct the fraction of errors $p \sim \binom{m}{r}/2^m$ with polynomial complexity and low redundancy $\rho \sim \binom{m}{2r+1}/2^m$ if $r = o(\sqrt{m/\log m})$. This algorithm is still limited to the rapidly vanishing probabilities p unlike any $p \to 0$ in Theorem 1. Note, however, that Theorem 1 achieves no improvements over BCH codes if probability p has an exponentially declining order $p \le 2^{-m^c}$ for any $c > 0$, nor does it give strongly optimal codes for $R \to 1$.

Sections II and III provide some background and address the common properties of RM and polar codes. Sections IV-VI introduce polarized design with a single boundary. We first design the weakly optimal codes of rates $R \to 1$ and then extend them to the strongly optimal codes of rate $R \to 0$.



Fig. 1. Decomposition $(\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_0+\mathbf{c}_1)$ of RM code $\mathcal{R}(4,4)$



Fig. 2. Paths and nodes of RM code $\mathcal{R}(2,5)$

II. Recursive design of RM and polar codes

Consider boolean polynomials $f(x)$ of degree r or less in m binary variables $x_1, \dots, x_m$, where $r \le m$. Vectors $x = (x_1, ..., x_m)$ will mark the positions of our code. Each map $f(x) : \mathbb{F}_2^m \to \mathbb{F}_2$ generates a codeword $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(f)$ of code $\mathcal{R}(r,m)$. We also use short notation $\mathbf{x}_{i\,|\,j} = (x_i, ..., x_j)$ for $i \le j$. Consider recursive decomposition

$$\begin{array}{l} f(x) = f_0(\mathbf{x}_{2\,|\,m}) + x_1 f_1(\mathbf{x}_{2\,|\,m}) = ... \\ = \sum_{i_1,...,i_\ell} x_1^{i_1} \cdot ... \cdot x_\ell^{i_\ell}\ f_{i_1,...,i_\ell}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell+1\,|\,m}) \\ = ... = \sum_{i_1,...,i_m} f_{i_1,...,i_m}\ x_1^{i_1} \cdot ... \cdot x_m^{i_m} \end{array} \tag{3}$$

The first step decomposes polynomial $f(x)$ into polynomials f_0 and f_1 of degrees $\deg f_0 \le \min\{r, m-1\}$ and $\deg f_1 \le r-1$. Then the codewords $\mathbf{c}_0 = \mathbf{c}(f_0)$ and $\mathbf{c}_1 = \mathbf{c}(f_1)$ belong to the codes $\mathcal{R}(r, m-1)$ and $\mathcal{R}(r-1, m-1)$ and form the codeword $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_0+\mathbf{c}_1$ of code $\mathcal{R}(r,m)$. Similarly, any subsequent step ℓ decomposes each polynomial with respect to $x_\ell^{i_\ell}$ as follows

$$f_{i_1,...,i_{\ell-1}}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell\,|\,m}) = \sum\nolimits_{i_\ell=0,1} f_{i_1,...,i_\ell}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell+1\,|\,m}) \cdot x_\ell^{i_\ell}$$

We then say that the ℓ-level binary *paths* $\xi_{1\,|\,\ell} = i_1, ..., i_\ell$ decompose the original polynomial $f(x)$ into sums of monomials $x_1^{i_1} \cdot ... \cdot x_\ell^{i_\ell} f_{i_1,...,i_\ell}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell+1\,|\,m})$. Finally, full paths $\xi = i_1, ..., i_m$ of step m define monomials $x^\xi \equiv x_1^{i_1} \cdot ... \cdot x_m^{i_m}$ with coefficients $f_\xi = f_{i_1,...,i_m} = 0, 1$. Note that each monomial x^ξ gives a codeword $\mathbf{c}(x^\xi)$ of weight $2^{m-w(\xi)}$, where $w(\xi)$ is the Hamming weight of the string ξ. RM codes $\mathcal{R}(r,m)$ include only $k(r,m)$ paths of weight $w(\xi) \le r$.

In Fig. 1 we use this representation for the full code $\mathcal{R}(4,4)$. Each decomposition step $\ell = 1, ..., 4$ is marked by the splitting monomial $x_\ell^{i_\ell}$. For example, path $\xi = 0110$ gives the coefficient f_{0110} associated with the monomial $x^\xi \equiv x_2 x_3$.

Fig. 2 depicts code $\mathcal{R}(2,5)$. Here we only include all paths ξ of weight $w(\xi) \le 2$. Note that any two paths $\xi_{1\,|\,\ell}$ entering some node have the same weight w and generate the same code $\mathcal{R}(r-w, m-\ell)$ on their extensions. For example, path $\xi = 01100$ proceeds from $\mathcal{R}(2,5)$ to the single bit $\mathcal{R}(0,0)$ via codes $\mathcal{R}(2,4)$, $\mathcal{R}(1,3)$, $\mathcal{R}(0,2)$, and $\mathcal{R}(0,1)$.

This design can be reformulated using a 2×2 matrix

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then code $\mathcal{R}(m,m)$ is generated by the Kronecker product $G(m,m) = G^{\otimes m}$. Each row of $G^{\otimes m}$ is the map of the monomial x^ξ for some path ξ. Similarly, matrix $G(r,m)$ is the map of all monomials x^ξ with paths $\xi = i_1, ..., i_m$ of weight $w(\xi) \le r$.

Now consider a single path ξ that ends with an information bit $f_{i_1,...,i_m} = 1$. Encoding proceeds in the reverse order $\ell = m, ..., 1$. We begin with a single bit codeword $\mathbf{c}(\xi_{m+1|m}) = 1$. In each step ℓ, we use recursion and obtain the codeword

$$\mathbf{c}\left(\xi_{\ell\,|\,m}\right) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{c}(\xi_{\ell+1\,|\,m}), \mathbf{c}(\xi_{\ell+1\,|\,m}) & \text{if } i_\ell = 0 \\ \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{c}(\xi_{\ell+1\,|\,m}) & \text{if } i_\ell = 1 \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

of length $2^{m-\ell+1}$. Thus, any path ξ is encoded in the vector $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(\xi)$ of length n. Also, $\mathbf{c}(\xi) = 0$ if $f_{i_1,...,i_m} = 0$.

Now consider a subset of N paths T. Then we encode N information bits via their paths and obtain codewords $\mathbf{c}(T) = \sum_{\xi \in T} \mathbf{c}(\xi)$. These codewords form a linear code $C(m,T)$. Here at any level ℓ, encoding adds two codewords of level $\ell+1$ entering any node $\xi_{\ell\,|\,m}$. Thus, encoding (4) performs $2^{m-\ell}$ operations on each of 2^ℓ nodes $\xi_{\ell\,|\,m}$ and has the overall complexity of $n \log_2 n$ over all levels ℓ.

Lemma 2. *Code $C(m,T)$ has length 2^m, dimension $|T|$ and distance 2^{m-r}, where $r = \max\{w(\xi), \xi \in T\}$ is the weight of the heaviest path in T. Code $\mathcal{R}(r,m)$ has the maximum code rate R among all codes $C(m,T)$ of the distance 2^{m-r}.*

Proof. Let weight r be achieved on some path $\psi \in T$. Then code $C(m,T)$ is generated by monomials x^ξ of degree r or less. Thus, $C(m,T) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(r,m)$. The monomial x^ψ has degree r and gives the minimum weight 2^{m-r}. □

III. Recursive decoding algorithms

Below, we use a map $x \to (-1)^x$ for any $x = 0, 1$ and consider a discrete memoryless channel (DMC) W with inputs ± 1. Vector $\mathbf{ab}$ will denote the component-wise product of vectors $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{uv})$ will denote the codewords $\mathbf{c}$ of a code $\mathcal{R}(r,m)$ with symbols ± 1. In particular, $\mathbf{1}^n$ now represents a former all-zero codeword. For any codeword $\mathbf{c}$, let $\mathbf{y}_0$, $\mathbf{y}_1$ be the two output halves corrupted by noise. We use double index i,j for any position $j = 1, ..., n/2$ in a half $i = 0, 1$. Define the posterior probability (PP) $q_{i,j} = \Pr\{c_{i,j} = 1 \mid y_{i,j}\}$ that 1 is sent in position i,j. We will often replace $q_{i,j}$ with two related quantities, which we call "the offsets" $g_{i,j}$ and the likelihoods $h_{i,j}$:

$$g_{i,j} = 2q_{i,j} - 1,\ h_{i,j} = q_{i,j} / (1 - q_{i,j}) \tag{5}$$

Thus, we will use vectors $\mathbf{q} = (q_{i,j})$, $\mathbf{g} = (g_{i,j})$ and $\mathbf{h} = (h_{i,j})$. For example, let W be a binary symmetric channel

BSC(p), where $p=(1-\epsilon)/2$. Then any output $y=\pm 1$ gives quantities $g(y)=\epsilon y$ and $h(y)=(1+\epsilon y)/(1-\epsilon y)$.

The following recursive algorithm $\Psi_r^m(\mathbf{q})$ of [2], [5] performs SCD of information bits in codes $\mathcal{R}(r,m)$ or their subcodes $C(m,T)$. Here we relegate decoding of vector $\mathbf{q}$ to two vectors $\mathbf{q}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{q}^{(0)}$ of length $n/2$. Vector $\mathbf{q}^{(1)}$ consists of PP $q_j^{(1)}\equiv \Pr\{v_j=1 \mid q_{0,j},\, q_{1,j}\}$ of symbols v_j in construction $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{uv})$. Simple recalculations [2] show that the offsets $g_j^{(1)}$ of symbols v_j can be expressed as the products of two offsets $g_{0,j}g_{1,j}$. Thus, we obtain vectors $\mathbf{g^{(1)}}$ and $\mathbf{q}^{(1)}$ with symbols

$$g_j^{(1)}=g_{0,j}g_{1,j},\;\; q_j^{(1)}=(1+g_j^{(1)})/2. \tag{6}$$

We may now apply some decoding algorithm Ψ_{r-1}^{m-1} to the vector $\mathbf{q}^{(1)}$ and obtain a vector $\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}\in\mathcal{R}(r-1,m-1)$ of length $n/2$. Now we have two corrupted versions $\mathbf{y}_0$ and $\mathbf{y}_1\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}$ of vector $\mathbf{u}$. We can then derive PP $q_j^{(0)}=\Pr\{u_j=1 \mid q_{0,j}\,,\, q_{1,j},\widetilde{v}_j\}$ of symbols u_j in the $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{uv})$ construction. Indeed, any symbol u_j has likelihoods $h_{0,j}$ and $(h_{1,j})^{\widetilde{v}_j}$ in the left and right halves, respectively. Then we combine the two likelihoods into their product:

$$h_j^{(0)}=h_{0,j}\,(h_{1,j})^{\widetilde{v}_j}\,,\;\; q_j^{(0)}=h_j^{(0)}/(1+h_j^{(0)}) \tag{7}$$

Then we can apply some decoding Ψ_r^{m-1} to vector $\mathbf{q}^{(0)}$ and obtain $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}\in\mathcal{R}(r,m-1)$.

Decomposition (6), (7) forms level $\ell=1$ of SCD, which can also be continued for vectors $\mathbf{q}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{q}^{(0)}$ on the codes $\mathcal{R}(r-1,m-1)$ and $\mathcal{R}(r,m-1)$. Then levels $\ell=2,...,m$ are processed similarly, moving decoding along the paths of Fig. 1 or Fig. 2. Any incomplete path $\xi_{1\,|\,\ell}$ begins with its $\mathbf{v}$-extension $(\xi_{1\,|\,\ell},1)$. Upon decoding, this path delivers its output $\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}$ to the $\mathbf{u}$-path $(\xi_{1\,|\,\ell},0)$. Thus, all paths are ordered lexicographically. Finally, the last step gives the likelihood $q_\xi=\Pr\{f_\xi=0\mid \mathbf{y}_0,\mathbf{y}_1\}$ of one information bit f_ξ on the path ξ. We then choose the more reliable bit f_ξ. It is easy to verify [2] that m decomposition steps give complexity $2n\log_2 n$.

Any subcode $C(m,T)$ is decoded similarly and assumes that all paths $\xi\notin T$ are frozen and give information bits $f_\xi\equiv 0$. Let all N paths in T be ordered lexicographically as $\xi^{(1)},...,\xi^{(N)}$. Then we have

Algorithm $\Psi(m,T)$ for code $C(m,T)$.
Given: a vector $\mathbf{q}=(q_{i,j})$ of PP.
Take $s=1,...,N$ and $\ell=1,...,m$.
For path $\xi^{(s)}=i_1^{(s)},...,i_m^{(s)}$ in step ℓ do:
Apply recalculations (6) if $i_\ell^{(s)}=1$
Apply recalculations (7) if $i_\ell^{(s)}=0$.
Output the bit $f_{\xi^{(s)}}$ for $\ell=m$.

IV. Path ordering in SC decoding

Let a binary code $C(m,T)$ be used over a symmetric DMC W. We now consider a code C_ξ defined by a single path $\xi=(i_1,...,i_m)$ and estimate its decoding error probability P_ξ. Let a codeword $\mathbf{1}^n$ be transmitted over this path. We now may assume that other paths give outputs $\widetilde{v}_j=1$ in recursive recalculations (5)-(7). Then we re-arrange (5)-(7) as follows

$$g_j^{(1)}=g_{0,j}g_{1,j},\quad g_j^{(0)}=(g_{0,j}+g_{1,j})/(1+g_{0,j}g_{1,j}) \tag{8}$$

$$h_j^{(0)}=h_{0,j}h_{1,j},\quad h_j^{(1)}=(1+h_{0,j}h_{1,j})/(h_{0,j}+h_{1,j}) \tag{9}$$

From now on, we may consider recalculations (8) and (9) as the sequences of channel transformations applied to the original random variables (rv) $g_{i,j}$ or $h_{i,j}$. In the end, we obtain a new memoryless channel $W_\xi: X\to Y_\xi$ that outputs a single rv $h(\xi)$ after m steps. For any parameter $\lambda>0$, we also consider rv $h^\lambda(\xi)$ and its expectation $\mathbb{E}h^{-\lambda}(\xi)$. Then the Chernoff upper bound gives

$$P_\xi\equiv\Pr\{h(\xi)<1\}\le\min_{\lambda>0}\mathbb{E}h^{-\lambda}(\xi)=\min_{\lambda>0}\mathbb{E}e^{-\lambda\ln h(\xi)}$$

Note that the quantity $\mathbb{E}h^{-1/2}(\xi)$ is identical to the Bhattacharyya parameter

$$Z(W)=\textstyle\sum_{y\in Y}\sqrt{W(y|0)}\sqrt{W(y|1)}$$

defined for a DMC channel $W_\xi: X\to Y_\xi$. For example, BSC(p) with $p=(1-g)/2$ gives

$$Z(W)=\mathbb{E}h^{-1/2}(\xi)=2\left(\tfrac{1+g}{2}\right)^{1/2}\left(\tfrac{1-g}{2}\right)^{1/2}=\sqrt{1-g^2}$$

In a more general setting [7], we decompose a binary symmetric DMC W_ξ into some number k of binary symmetric channels BSC$_{\theta_i}(p_i)$ that have transition error probabilities $p_i=(1-g_i)/2$ and occur with some probability distribution $\{\theta_i\}$, where $\sum_1^k\theta_i=1$. Then

$$Z(W_\xi)=\textstyle\sum_i\theta_i\sqrt{1-g_i^2} \tag{10}$$

Below we use the upper bound $P_\xi\le Z(W_\xi)$ employed by Arikan in [3]. It is also proved in [3] that a one step recursion $(W,W)\to\left(W^{(1)},W^{(0)}\right)$ of (9) gives parameters $Z(W^{(1)})$ and $Z(W^{(0)})$ such that

$$1-Z(W^{(1)})\ge\left[1-Z(W)\right]^2,\quad Z(W^{(0)})=Z^2(W) \tag{11}$$

Now consider a compound channel W_ξ as a set of BSC$_{\theta_i}(p_i)$. Then we can define the expectation of the offsets $g_i>0$:

$$\mathcal{G}\left(W_\xi\right)=\sum\nolimits_1^k\theta_i g_i$$

Note that $\sqrt{1-g^2}$ is a concave function. Also, $\sqrt{1-g^2}\ge 1-g$ for any $g\in[0,1]$. Thus, (10) yields two inequalities

$$1-\mathcal{G}\left(W_\xi\right)\le Z(W_\xi)\le\sqrt{1-\left[\mathcal{G}\left(W_\xi\right)\right]^2} \tag{12}$$

Given a one step recursion $(W,W)\to\left(W^{(1)},W^{(0)}\right)$, we can also take two independent identically distributed rv $g_{0,j}$ and $g_{1,j}$ in (8) and find the expectation of their product $g_j^{(1)}$ for the channel $W^{(1)}$. Then we have two equalities

$$\mathcal{G}(W^{(1)})=\mathcal{G}^2(W), \tag{13}$$

$$Z(W^{(0)})=Z^2(W) \tag{14}$$

Below we replace notation $Z(W_\xi)$ and $\mathcal{G}(W_\xi)$ with $Z(\xi)$ and $\mathcal{G}(\xi)$. Given a path $\xi=(i_1,...,i_m)$, we say that a path $\eta=$

$(j_1, ..., j_m)$ is its descendant if η is obtained from ξ by the following replacements in any positions s or $(s, s+1)$:

$$i_s = 1 \Rightarrow j_s = 0,$$
$$(i_s = 1, i_{s+1} = 0) \Rightarrow (j_s = 0, j_{s+1} = 1) \qquad (15)$$

Let $h(\xi)$ and $h(\eta)$ be the outputs of paths ξ and η obtained by recalculations (9). The following Lemma 3 uses a partial order for the paths ξ and η with respect to the quantities $\mathbb{E}h^{-\lambda}(\xi)$. A similar lemma was used in [10] for a slightly different set of recalculations, which approximate recalculations (9). In [8] and [9], this lemma is proved for the Bhattacharyya parameter $Z(W_\xi)$ with exact recalculations (9). In Appendix, we also post a proof of Lemma 3 for the arbitrary moments $\mathbb{E}h^{-\lambda}(\xi)$.

Lemma 3. *Recalculations (9) on some path ξ and its descendant η give the outputs $h(\xi)$ and $h(\eta)$ that satisfy inequalities*

$$\mathsf{E}h^{-\lambda}(\xi) \geq \mathsf{E}h^{-\lambda}(\eta), \quad \lambda \in [0, 1], \qquad (16)$$
$$\mathsf{E}h^{-\lambda}(\xi) \leq \mathsf{E}h^{-\lambda}(\eta), \quad \lambda \in [1, \infty). \qquad (17)$$

Corollary. *Any path ξ and its descendant η satisfy inequalities $P(\eta) \leq Z(\eta) \leq Z(\xi)$.*

Below, we say that a path ξ forms *a boundary* for all descendant paths η that satisfy replacements (15).

V. High-rate codes with a stepped boundary

Below, $\log x \equiv \log_2 x$. For $i = 1, ..., s$, consider a set of $2s$ non-negative ordered integers $\mathcal{L} = \{r_i, \ell_i\}$ such that $r_i + \ell_i = m_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{s} m_i = m$. We say that a path

$$\xi(\mathcal{L}) = \xi^{(1)}, ..., \xi^{(s)} = 1^{r_1}0^{\ell_1}, ..., 1^{r_s}0^{\ell_s} \qquad (18)$$

of length m bounds a path $\eta(\mathcal{L}) = \eta^{(1)}, ..., \eta^{(s)}$ if each section $\eta^{(i)}$ of length m_i has weight

$$w(\eta^{(i)}) \leq r_i, \; i = 1, ..., s \qquad (19)$$

Thus, each section $\eta^{(i)}$ is located to the right of $\xi^{(i)}$ as seen in Fig. 3 for a path $\xi(\mathcal{L}) = 1^{r_1}0^{\ell_1}1^{r_2}0^{\ell_2}1^{r_3}0^{\ell_3}$. Clearly, any path $\eta(\mathcal{L})$ satisfies (15).



Fig. 3. Polar code with 3 steps $1^{r_i}0^{\ell_i}$

Lemma 4. *Paths $\eta(\mathcal{L})$ of (19) generate the direct product*

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L}) = \otimes_{i=1}^{s} \mathcal{R}(r_i, m_i) \qquad (20)$$

of s RM codes $\mathcal{R}(r_i, m_i)$ of rates $R_i = k(r_i, m_i)/2^{m_i}$. Code $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$ has length 2^m, code rate $R_\mathcal{L} = \Pi_{i=1}^{s} R_i$, and construction complexity of order $n \log n$.

Proof. Each segment $\xi^{(i)}$ is a boundary for the subpaths $\eta^{(i)}$: $w(\eta^{(i)}) \leq r_i$. These single-step subpaths span the code $\mathcal{R}(r_i, m_i)$, which is generated by monomials of degree r_i or less taken over variables $x_{M_i+1}, ..., x_{M_i+m_i}$, where $M_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_j$, $M_1 = 0$. Thus, $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$ is the direct product of codes $\mathcal{R}(r_i, m_i)$ and has rate $R_\mathcal{L}$. Each row η of its generator matrix is a map $\mathbf{x}^\eta : \mathbb{F}_2^m \to \mathbb{F}_2$ of the monomial $\mathbf{x}^\eta$ defined by a path η. Thus, conditions (19) require m operations to verify that $\eta \in \eta(\mathcal{L})$ for any row η. For n-row verification, the complexity is bounded by the order $n \log n$. □

Consider a sequence of channels BSC(p) with $p \to 0$. Let $s = o(\log m)$ be some integer. We take a set of $2s$ numbers

$$\mathcal{L} = \left\{ r_i = 2^{i-1} \log \left({}^1\!/_p \right) - c_i, \;\; \ell_i = 2^{i-1} \log \log {}^1\!/_p \right\} \qquad (21)$$

where $c_1 = 6$, $c_2 = 3$ and $c_i = 0$ for $i \geq 3$. We also assume that $\mathcal{L}$ is a set of integers. Then the path $\xi(\mathcal{L})$ has the length

$$m = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{s} m_i = (2^s - 1)(\log {}^1\!/_p + \log \log {}^1\!/_p) - 9 \qquad (22)$$

An equivalent setting arises if $p \sim m2^{-m/(2^s-1)}$ for $m \to \infty$. Note that the case $s = 1$ gives a single code $\mathcal{R}(r, m)$ with $m - r \sim \log m$ and $p \sim m2^{-m}$. We first estimate the redundancy $\rho_\mathcal{L}$ of a code $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$ with boundary (21).

Lemma 5. *Codes $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$ with a boundary $\mathcal{L}$ of (21) satisfy the redundancy bound (2) for $p \to 0$.*

Proof. Let $\rho_i = 1 - R_i$ denote the redundancy of code $\mathcal{R}(r_i, m_i)$ used in step i of design (20). Then

$$\rho_\mathcal{L} = 1 - R_\mathcal{L} = 1 - \prod\nolimits_1^s (1 - \rho_i) \leq \sum\nolimits_1^s \rho_i$$

Let $\tau = \log {}^1\!/_p$. First, note that all codes $\mathcal{R}(r_i, m_i)$ have $\rho_i \to 0$ as $p \to 0$. Indeed, $\ell_i/m_i \leq (\log \tau)/\tau \to 0$ and

$$\rho_i \leq 2^{-m_i} \binom{m_i}{\ell_i} \leq 2^{-m_i[1-h(\ell_i/m_i)]}$$

Second, note that each segment $\xi^{(i)}$ of boundary (21) has the length $m_i \geq 2m_{i-1}$. Then $\rho_i \sim o(\rho_{i-1})$ and $\rho_\mathcal{L} \sim \rho_1$. Finally, we use the bounds

$$h(\ell_i/m_i) = (\ell_i/m_i) \log (em_i/\ell_i) + O(\ell_i^2/m_i^2)$$
$$\rho_1 \sim (64p/\tau) (e\tau/\log \tau)^{\log \tau} < p \left(\tau^{\log \tau} \right)$$

Thus, ρ_1 and $\rho_\mathcal{L}$ satisfy asymptotic bound (2). □

We now can prove Theorem 1 for construction (21). Here we use the same approach that employed the boundary paths in [2] and [10]; however, we extend this approach to a multi-step boundary (21) instead of the single–step and double-step boundaries used before. We proceed as follows. Consider any high-quality channel W, such as BSC(p) with $p \to 0$, and its two descendant channels $W^{(1)}$ and $W^{(0)}$. Note that the degrading channel $W^{(1)}$ and the upgrading channel $W^{(0)}$ exhibit a vastly different behavior. In particular, let the original parameter $Z(W) \sim \delta$ be close to 0 and the complementary parameter $\mathcal{G}(W) \in [1 - \delta, (1 - \delta^2)^{1/2}]$ be close to 1. Then the channel $W^{(0)}$ undergoes a sharp improvement over W and yields an exponentially declining parameter $Z(W^{(0)}) \sim \delta^2$, according to (14). By contrast, the channel $W^{(1)}$ experiences a relatively small degradation and yields $\mathcal{G}(W^{(1)}) \in [1 - 2\delta, 1 -$

$\delta^2]$. This allows us to completely compensate the relatively long chains of degrading channels 1^{r_i} with short chains 0^{ℓ_i} of upgrading channels. In fact, we will improve the overall performance in each step of the boundary (21). It is this superiority of the chains 0^{ℓ_i} that yields small ratios ℓ_i/r_i in our design and leads to a nearly optimal decline rate of redundancy $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$. The exact calculations are given below.

Consider two functions $f = f(n)$ and $r = r(n)$ that have the same sign. Then we write $f \lesssim r$ or $f \gtrsim r$ if the asymptotic ratio $\lambda = \lim_{n\to\infty} f/r$ is $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ or $\lambda \geq 1$, respectively. We also write $f \succ r$ if $f > r^c$ for some $c > 1$. Finally, consider inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} -x - x^2 < \ln(1-x) < -x, \;\; x \in (0, {}^1\!/_2\,) \\ 1 - x < -\ln x, \;\; x \in (0, 1) \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

which are tight as $x \to 0$ and $x \to 1$, respectively. Using these inequalities, we can rewrite (12) as

$$\log Z(\xi) < \tfrac{1}{2} \log[-2 \ln \mathcal{G}(\xi)] \tag{24}$$

$$\ln \mathcal{G}(\xi) \; > -Z(\xi) - Z^2(\xi) \tag{25}$$

Below, we extensively use a recursion that employs inequalities (24) and (25). We will also see that $Z(\xi) \to 0$ and $\mathcal{G}(\xi) \to 1$ for the selected path $\xi(\mathcal{L})$ of (21). In this case, we can also replace (24) and (25) with simpler inequalities $\log Z(\xi) \lesssim \frac{1}{2} \log [-\ln \mathcal{G}(\xi)]$ and $\ln \mathcal{G}(\xi) \gtrsim -Z(\xi)$.

Lemma 6. *Codes $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$ with a boundary (21) achieve an output bit error rate $P_\eta \to 0$ for each path $\eta(\mathcal{L})$ under SCD on a BSC(p) with $p \to 0$.*

Proof. Given the boundary $\xi(\mathcal{L})$, we will estimate the Bhattacharyya parameters

$$Z_{(i)} \equiv Z\left[1^{r_1}0^{\ell_1}...1^{r_i}\right], \; Z^{(i)} \equiv Z\left[1^{r_1}0^{\ell_1}...1^{r_i}0^{\ell_i}\right]$$

obtained in processing of each step i. We also use similar notation $\mathcal{G}_{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(i)}$ for the offsets obtained in step i. The original channel BSC(p) gives parameter $\mathcal{G} = 1 - 2p$, where $p \to 0$. For the first segment 1^{r_1}, equality (13) and the upper bound (12) give:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{(1)} &= (1-2p)^{1/(64p)} \sim e^{-1/32} \\ Z_{(1)} &\lesssim \left(1 - e^{-1/16}\right)^{1/2} < 2^{-2} \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

For the next segment 0^{ℓ_1}, equality (14) gives

$$Z^{(1)} = \left[Z_{(1)}\right]^{2^{\ell_1}} < 2^{-2\log {}^1\!/_p} = p^2$$

Then $\mathcal{G}^{(1)} \geq 1 - Z^{(1)}$, according to (12), and we proceed with the segment $1^{r_2}0^{\ell_2}$ using (13):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{(2)} &\geq (1-p^2)^{p^{-2}/8} \sim e^{-1/8} \\ Z_{(2)} &\lesssim \left(1 - e^{-1/4}\right)^{1/2} < 1/2 \\ Z^{(2)} &= [Z_{(2)}]^{2^{\ell_2}} < 2^{-\tau^2} = p^\tau \end{aligned}$$

Note that $2^{r_i} = p^{-2^{i-1}}$ and $2^{\ell_i} = \tau^{2^{i-1}}$ for $i \geq 3$. Now we use inequalities (24) and (25) to prove that parameters $Z^{(i)}$ rapidly decline:

$$Z^{(i)} \leq p^{t_i}, \;\; t_i = \tau^{2^i - i - 1} \tag{27}$$

Indeed, $Z^{(2)}$ satisfies (27). We take $Z^{(i-1)} \leq p^{t_{i-1}}$ and use induction on the i-th segment $1^{r_i}0^{\ell_i}$. Then inequalities (24) and (25) give

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \mathcal{G}_{(i)} \;\; &\geq -2^{r_i}[p^{t_{i-1}} + p^{2t_{i-1}}] \gtrsim -2^{r_i} p^{t_{i-1}} \\ \log Z_{(i)} &< \tfrac{1}{2} \log[-2 \ln \mathcal{G}_{(i)}] \lesssim \tfrac{1}{2}\,(t_{i-1} - r_i) \log p \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Note that $r_i = o(t_{i-1})$. Thus, $\log Z_{(i)} \leq s_i \log p$, where

$$s_i = t_{i-1}/\tau = \tau^{2^{i-1} - i - 1} = o\,(t_{i-1})$$

Then

$$\log Z^{(i)} = 2^{\ell_i} \log Z_{(i)} \leq \tau^{2^{i-1}} s_i \log p = t_i \log p \tag{29}$$

This proves (27) and gives $P_\eta \leq Z^{(s)}$ for each path η. □

Discussion. Inequalities (28) and (29) show that the initial chains 1^{r_i} and the subsequent chains 0^{ℓ_i} affect parameters $Z_{(i)}$ and $Z^{(i)}$ in a very different way. In particular, (28) shows that any chain 1^{r_i} reduces the previous exponential order $t_{i-1} = \log_p Z^{(i-1)}$ to $t_{i-1}/2 - o(t_{i-1})$. By contrast, the stretch 0^{ℓ_i} increases this order above $2^{\ell_i}(t_{i-1}/\tau)$. For this reason, good BSC(p) with $p \to 0$ may overcompensate long chains 1^{r_i} of degrading channels with the much shorter chains 0^{ℓ_i} of upgrading channels. Note also that equalities (13) and (14) are critical in our proof since they give exact estimates $\mathcal{G}_{(i)}$ and $Z^{(i)}$ in all intermediate steps of the segments 1^{r_i} or 0^{ℓ_i}, without any loss in performance. To this end, note that inequalities (11) and (12) alone cannot furnish Lemma 6. For example, inequalities (11) replace estimate (26) with a loose bound $Z_{(1)} \leq 1 - e^{-1/\left(32\sqrt{p}\right)}$. This bound will require a much longer path 0^{ℓ_1} to achieve a low quantity $Z^{(2)}$, which in turn increases redundancies ρ_1 and $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$ above the bound (12) of the weakly optimal codes.

However, this particular construction fails to give the optimal redundancy $\rho_{\text{opt}} \sim p \log {}^1\!/_p$ or even reduce $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$ to the order of $cp \log {}^1\!/_p$ for some constant $c > 1$. Nor is it known if other low-complexity algorithms for polar or other codes can achieve ρ_{opt} for $p \to 0$. Note also that the single-boundary set $\eta(\mathcal{L})$ of Lemma 6 does not form an optimized polar code since many other paths η also have a vanishing output error rate. For example, any initial segment 1^r of length $r < r_1$ gives rise to many paths $\eta \notin \eta(\mathcal{L})$. To reduce redundancy $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$, one may consider a growing set $\{\xi\}$ of boundary paths ξ and form an entire "envelope" of the descendant paths $\eta(\xi)$. Calculating the redundancy for this envelope-type boundary is another open problem that may be related to the Young diagrams.

VI. Low-rate codes with a stepped boundary

Consider a sequence of the BSCs(p) with $p = (1-\epsilon)/2$, where $\epsilon \to 0$ as length $n \to \infty$. Below we study capacity-achieving (CA) codes of rate $R \sim C$ for the case of a vanishing capacity $C = 1 - h(p) \sim \epsilon^2/\ln 4$. It is proved

in [13] that RM codes $\mathcal{R}(r,\mu)$ are CA codes under ML-decoding if $r=o(\mu)$. However, only codes $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$ of length $k=2^\mu$ or their concatenations are known to be CA-codes of polynomial complexity. More specifically, consider a BSC(p_*) with capacity $C\to 0$ and transition error probability

$$p_*=(1-\epsilon_*)/2,\ \epsilon_*=(C\ln 4)^{1/2} \tag{30}$$

According to [14], for any parameter $\theta\in(0,1)$, codes $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$ of code rate $R=C(1-\theta)$ achieve on BSC(p_*) the output bit error rate $P_*\le k^{-\theta}$ or less with complexity $O(k\log k)$.

To proceed with the low-rate codes, we need to substantially reduce the output error rate of (27). This is done in the following theorem, where we reduce the error rate $P_\eta\le Z^{(s)}$ at the expense of a slightly higher redundancy $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$. Consider a boundary

$$\mathcal{L}_c=\left\{r_i=2^{i-1}\left(\log{}^1\!/_p\right)-c_i,\ \ \ell_i=c2^{i-1}\log{}^1\!/_p\right\} \tag{31}$$

where $c_1=6$, $c_i=0$ for $i\ge 2$, and $c\in(0,1)$ is a parameter. This boundary has length

$$m=\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{s}m_i=(c+1)\left(2^s-1\right)\left(\log{}^1\!/_p\right)-6 \tag{32}$$

Lemma 7. *Codes $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L}_c)$ with boundary (31) have redundancy $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}\to 0$ as $p\to 0$. These codes perform SCD with an output bit error rate P_η, where for each path η,*

$$\log P_\eta\lesssim -2^{2-s}p^{-c(2^s-1)} \tag{33}$$

Proof. Note that $\ell_i/m_i=c/(c+1)$. For $i\ge 2$, let

$$c_1\equiv h(\ell_i/m_i)=h\left[c/(c+1)\right]<1.$$

Then $\rho_i\le 2^{-m_i(1-c_1)}=o(\rho_{i-1})$ for $p\to 0$, and

$$\rho_{\mathcal{L}}\sim\rho_1\le 64p^{(1+c)(1-c_1)}\to 0$$

Also, $2^{r_i}=p^{-2^{i-1}}$ and $2^{\ell_i}=p^{-c2^{i-1}}$ for $i\ge 2$. Next, we estimate parameters $Z_{(i)}$ and $Z^{(i)}$ and follow the proof of Lemma 6. Given the same length r_1, we again obtain $Z_{(1)}<1/4$ of (26). The next segment 0^{ℓ_1} gives

$$Z^{(1)}=\left[Z_{(1)}\right]^{2^{\ell_1}}<2^{-2p^{-c}}$$

Then the segment $1^{r_2}0^{\ell_2}$ yields estimates

$$\begin{aligned}\ln\mathcal{G}_{(2)}\ &\gtrsim -p^{-2}Z^{(1)}\gtrsim -p^{-2}2^{-2p^{-c}}\\ \log Z_{(2)}&\lesssim\tfrac{1}{2}\log\left[-2\ln\mathcal{G}_{(2)}\right]\lesssim -p^{-c}\\ \log Z^{(2)}&\lesssim -2^{\ell_2}p^{-c}\lesssim -p^{-3c}\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Now we prove that parameters $Z^{(i)}$ rapidly decline:

$$\log Z^{(i)}\lesssim -2^{2-i}p^{-c(2^i-1)} \tag{35}$$

Indeed, $Z^{(2)}$ satisfies (35). We take $Z^{(i-1)}$ of (35) and proceed with the i-th segment $1^{r_i}0^{\ell_i}$. We proceed similarly to (34),

$$\begin{aligned}\ln\mathcal{G}_{(i)}\ &\gtrsim -2^{r_i}Z^{(i-1)}\\ \log Z_{(i)}&<\tfrac{1}{2}\log\left[-2\ln\mathcal{G}_{(i)}\right]\lesssim\tfrac{1}{2}r_i+\tfrac{1}{2}\log Z^{(i-1)}\end{aligned}$$

Since $r_i=o(\log Z^{(i-1)})$, we obtain :

$$\log Z^{(i)}=2^{\ell_i}\log Z_{(i)}\lesssim 2^{\ell_i-1}\log Z^{(i-1)}$$

which gives (35) and proves the theorem. □

We will now combine codes $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$ with the high-rate polar codes of Lemma 7 to obtain new CA codes.

Note that code $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$ is defined by a boundary path $\xi^{(0)}=1^10^{\mu-1}$. We then combine $\xi^{(0)}$ with the boundary $\mathcal{L}_c$ of (31) and obtain the extended boundary

$$\mathcal{L}_{ext}=\{r_0=1,\ell_0=\mu-1,\ \mathcal{L}_c\} \tag{36}$$

Lemma 4 shows that $\mathcal{L}_{ext}$ generates the direct product $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ of $s+1$ RM codes $\mathcal{R}(r_i,m_i)$. Thus, code $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ has code rate R and length N, where

$$\begin{aligned}R&=R(1,\mu)R_{\mathcal{L}_c}\sim(\mu+1)/2^\mu\\ N&=kn,\ \ k=2^\mu,\ \ n=2^m\end{aligned}$$

Codes $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ also represent a simple concatenated construction, which first uses $\mu+1$ arbitrary codewords of the code $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L}_c)$ and forms an $(\mu+1)\times n$ matrix. Then each column of this matrix is encoded into the code $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$. The result is an $k\times n$ matrix, which represents a codeword formed by the inner code of length k and s outer codes of length n. Below we take $\mu,m\to\infty$. Below we take $p_o=2^{-\mu\theta}$ in (31).

Theorem 8. *Let codes $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ of code rate $C(1-\theta)$ with an s-step boundary (36) be used on a BSC(p_*) of capacity $C\to 0$. For any $\theta\in(0,1)$, codes $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ have decoding complexity $O(N\log N)$ in length $N=nk$ and achieve a bit error probability P_η such that*

$$\log P_\eta\prec -2^{2-s}n^{c/(c+1)} \tag{37}$$

Proof. Decoding of codes $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ can be expressed as SCD; below we also describe it as concatenated decoding of inner codes. We take codes $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$ of rate $\epsilon^2/\ln 4$ as $\theta\to 0$. Then $R_{ext}\sim(1-\theta)\,\epsilon^2/\ln 4$ as $m\to\infty$. Given a received $2^\mu\times 2^m$ matrix, we first perform ML decoding of each column of length 2^μ into the code $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$. The resulting $(\mu+1)\times 2^m$ matrix contains errors with probability p_o or less. Each row is decoded into the code $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$ using SCD on a BSC(p_o). Note that for any $\theta\in(0,1)$,

$$m=\left(2^s-1\right)(c+1)\,\mu\theta-c_1 \tag{38}$$

Then (33) gives the bit error rate (37):

$$\log P_\eta\lesssim -2^{2-s}2^{c\mu\theta(2^s-1)} \tag{39}$$

Thus, codes $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ are CA codes. Inner and outer decodings have the complexity $nk\log k$ and $\mu n\log n$ bounded by $N\log N$. □

Discussion. According to (39), the order $\log P_\eta$ depends exponentially on the margin θ between the code rate R and channel capacity C. Below, we compare the performance of codes $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ for the same code rate $R\sim C(1-\theta)$, and define the minimum code length k or N that enables a given output bit error P. Here we consider an asymptotic case with parameters $c\to 1$ and $P\to 0$. For codes $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$, we have $k\sim P^{-1/\theta}$. For codes $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$, we use notation

$A = 2^s\theta$. Then parameters (38) and (39) yield asymptotic approximations

$$n = 2^m \asymp k^{2A},\ \log P \asymp -n^{1/2} \asymp -k^A \qquad (40)$$

(here $f \asymp r$ if $\log f \sim \log r$). Recall that the outer codes $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L}_c)$ require a vanishing input error rate $k^{-\theta}$, in which case $k = B^{1/\theta}$ for some $B \to \infty$. Then $N = k^{2A+1} \asymp B^{1/\theta}(\log^2 P)$. Thus, codes $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ can improve the trade-off $k \sim P^{-1/\theta}$ of the inner codes $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$ only for the declining error rates $P = o(1)$. We further note that this is the case for all other known concatenated constructions. In particular, consider a classic concatenation that uses the inner codes $\mathcal{R}(1,\mu)$ and the outer RS codes of the same length 2^μ and code rate $R \to 1$. It can be verified that this construction requires the overall length $N_1 \asymp \max\{\theta^2 \log^2 P, B^{2/\theta}\}$ given the same inner length $k = B^{1/\theta}$. One possible advantage of codes $\mathcal{R}_{ext}$ over classic concatenation is the extra parameter s that allows the outer code length n arbitrarily exceed the inner length k in (38). In particular, we have inequality $N \lesssim N_1$ for both cases $B^{1/\theta} < \log^2 P$ and $B^{1/\theta} > \log^2 P$. Thus, construction of Theorem 8 allows us to shorten the length N_1 of the classical concatenated construction. More generally, it is an important problem to find low-complexity codes of code rate $R \to 0$ that can achieve the vanishing error rates at the shorter lengths of order $N \sim 2^{c/\theta}$ for some $c \in (0,1)$.

VII. Concluding remarks

In this paper, we address explicit constructions of polar codes that are nearly optimal for the extreme cases of a BSC(p) with $p \to 0$ and $p \to 1/2$. In case of $p \to 0$, we obtain weakly optimal codes of rate $R \to 1$, whose redundancy order $\log \rho$ declines at the optimal rate (2). For the low-rate codes, we obtain the optimal decline of code rate $R \to 0$. These simple constructions are completely defined by a single s-step boundary path $\xi(\mathcal{L})$ that only depends on transition error probability p. In turn, this boundary defines all other paths η, which form other sequences of upgrading-degrading channels included in code construction. An important point is that the boundary $\mathcal{L}$ consists of the consecutive chains of upgrading or degrading channels, with a growing length of each segment. For this reason, these single-boundary codes can be considered as direct products of s Reed-Muller codes. One way to amplify this design is to consider polar codes that include multiple overlapping boundaries $\mathcal{L}_1, ..., \mathcal{L}_k$ and admit all descendant paths η that satisfy at least one boundary restriction. Another interesting problem is to extend this design to other code rates and consider the explicit constructions that admit the finite-length stretches of the upgrading-degrading channels.

References

[1] F.J. MacWilliams and N.J.A. Sloane, *"The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes,"* North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.

[2] I. Dumer, "Recursive decoding and its performance for low-rate Reed-Muller codes," IEEE Trans. Info. Theory, vol. 50, pp. 811-823, May 2004.

[3] E. Arikan, "Channel polarization: A method for constructing capacity-achieving codes for symmetric binary-input memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory,* vol. 55 , pp. 3051-3073, July 2009.

[4] R. Blahut, "*Algebraic codes for data transmission*," Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 2003.

[5] I. Dumer and K. Shabunov, "Near-optimum decoding for subcodes of Reed-Muller codes," *2001 IEEE Intern. Symp. Info. Theory*, Washington DC, USA, June 24-29, 2001, p. 329.

[6] I. Dumer and K. Shabunov, "Soft decision decoding of Reed-Muller codes: recursive lists," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 52, pp. 1260-1266, March 2006.

[7] S. B. Korada. "*Polar Codes for Channel and Source Coding,*" Ph.D. thesis, Ecole Polytechnique Federale De Lausanne, 2009.

[8] C. Schürch, "A Partial Order For the Synthesized Channels of a Polar Code," *2016 IEEE Intern. Symp. Info. Theory (ISIT 2016)*, Barcelona, Spain, July 1-5, 2016, pp. 220-224.

[9] M. Bardet, V. Dragoi, A. Otmani, and J.-P. Tillich, "Algebraic properties of polar codes from a new polynomial formalism," *2016 IEEE Intern. Symp. Info. Theory (ISIT 2016)*, Barcelona, Spain, July 1-5, 2016, pp. 230–234.

[10] M. Burnashev and I. Dumer, "Error Exponents for Recursive Decoding of Reed-Muller Codes on a Binary-Symmetric Channel," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, 52, 11, pp. 4880-4891, 2006.

[11] V. Guruswami and P. Xia, "Polar Codes: Speed of Polarization and Polynomial Gap to Capacity," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory,* vol. 61, pp. 3-16, Jan. 2015.

[12] R. Saptharishi, A. Shpilka and B.L. Volk, "Efficiently decoding Reed-Muller codes from random errors," *Proc. 48th Symp. Theory of Comp. (STOC '16)*, pp. 227-235, Cambridge, MA, USA, June 19, 2016.

[13] E. Abbe, A. Shpilka, and A. Wigderson, " Reed-Muller Codes for Random Erasures and Errors," *Proc. 47th Symp. Theory of Comp. (STOC '15)*, pp. 297–306, Portland, OR, USA, June 15, 2015.

[14] V. Sidel'nikov and A. Pershakov, "Decoding of Reed-Muller codes with a large number of errors," Probl. Info. Transmission, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 80-94, 1992.

[15] T.J. Richardson, M.A. Shokrollahi, and R.L. Urbanke, "Design of capacity-approaching irregular low-density parity-check codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 619-637, 2001.

Appendix. *Proof of Lemma 3.* To prove Lemma *3*, we will assume that any channel W_ξ satisfies the "symmetry" condition ([15], p. 628). This condition (expressed in terms of log likelihoods in [15]) implies that the likelihoods h of transmitted symbols have the probability density function (pdf) $p(x) \equiv p_h(x)$ such that

$$p(x)/p(x^{-1}) = x, \quad \forall x \in (0,\infty). \qquad (41)$$

Condition (41) can be used for many conventional channels; in particular, for a BSC(p) or an AWGN channel. It is also proven in [15] that the "symmetry" condition is left intact by transformations (9). Namely, both rv $h_j^{(0)}$ and $h_j^{(1)}$ in (9) satisfy condition (41) if so do rv $h_{0,j}$ and $h_{1,j}$.

Next, we consider an output $h(a)$ of the prefix path a. Let h_1, h_2, h_3, and h_4 denote 4 independent ID rv, which represent 4 different outputs $h(a)$ of the prefix a. We need to calculate the outputs $h_{01} \equiv h(a01)$ and $h_{10} \equiv h(a10)$ and prove that $\mathsf{E}h_{01}^{-\lambda} \le \mathsf{E}h_{10}^{-\lambda}$ if $\lambda \in [0,1]$. An equivalent formulation is to prove inequality $\mathsf{E}f_{01}^{\lambda} \le \mathsf{E}f_{10}^{\lambda}$ given *inverse* likelihoods $f_i = h_i^{-1}$, $f_{01} = h_{01}^{-1}$ and $f_{10} = h_{10}^{-1}$. Correspondingly, we consider the 4-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}_+^4$ formed by vectors $F = (f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4)$ with positive coordinates. For extended subpaths $a01$ and $a10$, recalculations (9) give the rv outputs

$$f_{01} = \frac{f_1 f_2 + f_3 f_4}{1 + f_1 f_2 f_3 f_4},$$

$$f_{10} = \frac{(f_1 + f_2)(f_3 + f_4)}{(1 + f_1 f_2)(1 + f_3 f_4)}.$$

Below we also consider another rv

$$u_{01} = \frac{(f_1 + f_2)(f_3 + f_4)}{2(1 + f_1 f_2 f_3 f_4)}$$

and prove two inequalities

$$\mathsf{E}f_{01}^{\lambda} \le \mathsf{E}u_{01}^{\lambda} \le \mathsf{E}f_{10}^{\lambda},\ \lambda \in [0,1]. \tag{42}$$

To prove the left inequality, note that $u_{01} = \left(f'_{01} + f''_{01}\right)/2$, where

$$f'_{01} = \frac{f_1 f_3 + f_2 f_4}{1 + f_1 f_2 f_3 f_4},\ f''_{01} = \frac{f_1 f_4 + f_2 f_3}{1 + f_1 f_2 f_3 f_4}.$$

The variables f'_{01} and f''_{01} are obtained from f_{01} by replacements $f_2 \Leftrightarrow f_3$ and $f_2 \Leftrightarrow f_4$ respectively. Then independent and ID rv f_i give equalities

$$\mathsf{E}f_{01}^{\lambda} = \mathsf{E}\left(f'_{01}\right)^{\lambda} = \mathsf{E}\left(f''_{01}\right)^{\lambda}$$

Since x^{λ} is a concave function of any $x > 0$ for $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

$$\frac{\left(f'_{01}\right)^{\lambda}}{2} + \frac{\left(f''_{01}\right)^{\lambda}}{2} \le \left(\frac{f'_{01} + f''_{01}}{2}\right)^{\lambda} = u_{01}^{\lambda} \tag{43}$$

and $\mathsf{E}f_{01}^{\lambda} \le \mathsf{E}u_{01}^{\lambda}$.

To compare the expectations $\mathsf{E}u_{01}^{\lambda}$ and $\mathsf{E}f_{10}^{\lambda}$, we combine each vector $F \equiv F_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$ with three other vectors (which may also coincide with F) :

$$F_1 = (f_1^{-1}, f_2^{-1}, f_3, f_4),\ F_2 = (f_1^{-1}, f_2^{-1}, f_3^{-1}, f_4^{-1}),$$
$$F_3 = (f_1, f_2, f_3^{-1}, f_4^{-1})$$

We also consider the *orbit* $\mathbf{T} = \{F_0, F_1, F_2, F_3\}$ of vector $F_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$. Clearly, the whole space $\mathbb{R}_+^4$ is now partitioned into non-intersecting orbits $\mathbf{T}$. Below we use notation

$$\alpha = f_1 f_2, \quad \beta = f_3 f_4,\ A = (f_1 + f_2)(f_3 + f_4).$$

It can be readily verified that the rv $f_{10}(\mathbf{T})$ does not change on the orbit $\mathbf{T}$:

$$f_{10}(F_i) = \frac{A}{(1+\alpha)(1+\beta)},\ i = 0, ..., 3, \tag{44}$$

while $u_{01}(\mathbf{T})$ takes two values

$$u_{01}(F_0) = u_{01}(F_2) = \frac{A}{2(1+\alpha\beta)}$$
$$u_{01}(F_1) = u_{01}(F_3) = \frac{A}{2(\alpha+\beta)}$$

Let $p = p(F_0)$ denote the pdf of the 4-dimensional rv $F_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$, which consists of inverse likelihoods. According to (41), the pdfs of other orbit points are

$$p(F_2) = \alpha\beta p,\ p(F_1) = \alpha p,\ p(F_3) = \beta p \tag{45}$$

Then simple recalculations using equalities (44) and (45) give

$$\mathsf{E}f_{10}^{\lambda}(\mathbf{T}) = pA^{\lambda}\left[(1+\alpha)(1+\beta)\right]^{1-\lambda},$$
$$\mathsf{E}u_{01}^{\lambda}(\mathbf{T}) = pA^{\lambda}2^{-\lambda}\left[(1+\alpha\beta)^{1-\lambda} + (\alpha+\beta)^{1-\lambda}\right]$$

Since $x^{1-\lambda}$ is a concave function, we have inequality

$$\frac{(1+\alpha\beta)^{1-\lambda}}{2} + \frac{(\alpha+\beta)^{1-\lambda}}{2} \le \left[\frac{(1+\alpha)(1+\beta)}{2}\right]^{1-\lambda} \tag{46}$$

which proves the right inequality in (42). The second case with $\lambda \in [1, \infty)$ is studied similarly. Now both x^{λ} and $x^{1-\lambda}$ are a convex functions of $x > 0$. Then inequalities (43) and (46) change their sign and we have inequality (17). $\square$